

REMARKS

In the Office Action of January 11, 2008, the Examiner rejected the pending claims in view of the Matsuyama reference (U.S. Patent No. 6,767,282), the Kim reference (U.S. Patent No. 5,694,340), the Lode reference (U.S. Patent No. 3,828,345), the Top Gear Overdrive reference, the Geen reference (U.S. Patent No. 4,764,748, , the Woolston reference (U.S. Patent No. 6,162,123), the Yasue reference (U.S. Patent No. 6,189,053), Childs reference (U.S. Patent No. 5,623,545), the Lum reference (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0224763), or some combination thereof. By this paper, the Applicant has amended the claims of the application to highlight the subject matter that the Applicant believes is allowable over the art of record. Hence, reconsideration of the above-captioned application in light of the amendments and remarks contained herein is now respectfully requested.

After carefully reviewing the art of record, the Applicant notes that none of the references cited, either by themselves or in combination with each other, disclose the combination of a system that measures the acceleration of an object at a plurality of intervals and converts this movement data into a first set of data and then translates the first set of data into a second set by selecting among stored output data values that corresponds to the first range of data based on the acceleration data (*See, e.g.*, Claim 1 as amended). An example of this feature is illustrated in Figure 10(a) of the Application as filed. The value R, which is a strength value related to distance, is selected from a group of set values based upon the sensed acceleration signals. The group of set values are empirically determined values that correlate actual golf swings to magnitude values that can be simply provided to the game processor.

In contrast, Matsuyama is not measuring the acceleration of the object at all, it is simply using position to determine acceleration. It is only using the accelerometer the orientation of the club during the swing rather than the actual movement of the club. As Matsuyama is not even using the accelerometers to determine acceleration, there is no teaching in Matsuyama of the concept of using the acceleration data to select an output value from stored output values in the same manner as is claimed by the Applicant.

Further, with respect to the newly cited Kim reference, Kim is clearly teaching that an involved acceleration calculation is done on the fly (*See, e.g.*, Kim Col. 7 line 1 to Col 8 line 65). Kim necessarily requires a considerably more complex approach to determining the

Application No.: 10/741,308
Filing Date.: December 19, 2003

corresponding output value than the Applicant's system. The Applicant's system is taking a complex input signal, determining the acceleration and then is correlating a simpler output value that the game expects to see in a much less complex manner than is contemplated by the Kim reference. This decrease in complexity as a result of using the acceleration data to select the appropriate value as opposed to calculating it exactly results in a process that is much less expensive in terms of processing capabilities and cost which is important in the video game market. The Applicant believes that this combination is neither shown or suggested in the Geen, Top Drive, Woolston, Yasue, Childs or Lum references.

As such, the Applicant believes that Claim 1 is allowable over the art of record. The Applicant further believes that Claims 20, 36, 46 and 56 define additional patentable subject matter and are further allowable for reasons similar to the reasons given above with respect to Claim 1. The Applicant further submits that Claims 2 – 19, 21 – 35, 37 – 45, 47 – 55 and 57 – 64 define additional patentable subject matter and are further allowable due to their respective dependency on Claims 1, 20, 36, 46 and 56. The Applicant therefore believes that the above-captioned application is in condition for allowance and requests the prompt allowance of the same. Should there be any impediment to the prompt allowance of this application the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at the number shown below.

No Disclaimers or Disavowals

Although the present communication may include alterations to the application or claims, or characterizations of claim scope or referenced art, the Applicants are not conceding in this application that previously pending claims are not patentable over the cited references. Rather, any alterations or characterizations are being made to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this application. The Applicants reserve the right to pursue at a later date any previously pending or other broader or narrower claims that capture any subject matter supported by the present disclosure, including subject matter found to be specifically disclaimed herein or by any prior prosecution. Accordingly, reviewers of this or any parent, child or related prosecution history shall not reasonably infer that the Applicants have made any disclaimers or disavowals of any subject matter supported by the present application.

Application No.: 10/741,308
Filing Date.: December 19, 2003

Co-Pending Applications of Assignee

Applicant wishes to draw the Examiner's attention to the following co-pending applications of the present application's assignee.

Serial Number	Title	Filed
10/957,338	INPUT SYSTEM AND METHOD	10/1/04

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: _____

7/9/08

By: _____

Michael H. Trenholm
Registration No. 37,743
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20995
(951) 781-9231

5624955:lw
070908